UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE
3 1761 02194870 8

PA
2340
.C6
1910
SMC

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/cursusinmediaeva00claruoft

The Cursus in Mediaeval and Vulgar Latin

By Albert C. Clark M.A.

(A Paper read to the Oxford Philological Society on February 18, 1910)

Oxford
At the Clarendon Press
1910

HENRY FROWDE, M.A.
PUBLISHER TO THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD
LONDON, EDINBURGH, NEW YORK
TORONTO AND MELBOURNE

PREFACE

THE first part of this paper contains an account of the mediaeval *cursus* drawn from various works, most of which are mentioned in the Bibliography to my *Fontes Prosae Numerosae* (Oxford, 1909). I have also used with profit Rockinger's collection of documents in *Quellen z. bayr. u. deutsch. Geschichte* (München, 1863), and Gabrielli's valuable dissertation, *L'epistole di Cola di Rienzo e l'epistolografia medievale* in *Archivio della R. Soc. Rom. di Storia patria*, xi (1888). I need hardly say that this portion of my paper does not claim to be more than a popular account of the results at which others have arrived, and I should not have thought of printing it but for certain suggestions about the influence of accent in earlier prose, which occurred to me when I was writing, and which, so far as I know, are new. As I wish to obtain the opinion of others upon these points, I venture to publish my paper, with a few corrections and additions.

I should like to take this opportunity of remedying a very unfortunate omission in the Bibliography previously mentioned, viz. *De clausulis Ciceronianis*, by J. Wolff, a pupil of Skutsch (1901). I was well acquainted with this very valuable work, which I have mentioned elsewhere (*Classical Review*, 1905, p. 165), and the omission was due to accident. I also regret that Bornecque's elaborate and learned work, *Les clausules métriques latines*, was unknown to me. Among other writings which have since come into my hands are Skutsch's important article on *Sprache, Metrik und Rhythmus der Römer in ihren Wechselbeziehungen* in *Zeitschrift f. d. Gymn.-Wesen*, 1909, pp. 67–74, and four works by pupils of his, viz. K. Münscher, *Die Rhythmen in Isokrates' Panegyrikos* (1908), V. Münch, *De Clausulis a Valerio Maximo adhibitis* (1909), J. Gladisch,

De Clausulis Quintilianeis (1909), and the valuable edition of Firmicus Maternus by K. Ziegler (1908). I would also mention Lehnert's exhaustive *Bericht über die rhetorische Literatur bis* 1906 in Bursian's *Jahresbericht* 1909 *Band* CXLII.

I have also to correct a serious misprint in the Preface to the same work (p. 6). Zielinski's three Forms, if the molossus base is admitted in 2 and 3, come to 60 per cent., not 40 per cent.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

THE CURSUS IN MEDIAEVAL AND VULGAR LATIN

THE sophist Thrasymachus is chiefly known to us from the merciless caricatures of Plato. In the Phaedrus he is depicted as the 'Chalcedonian giant who can put a whole company of people into a passion and out of it again by his mighty magic: and is first-rate at inventing or disposing of any sort of calumny on any grounds or none'. In the Republic he appears as a mere child in the hands of Socrates, and resorts to insolence in order to cover his discomfiture. No one could suspect that he was one of the greatest inventors in the field of literature that the world has seen, who laid down the lines upon which prose was to develop for nearly two thousand years.

We learn from Cicero, whose information is drawn from Theophrastus, that Thrasymachus was the first person who deliberately introduced metrical cadences into prose for rhetorical effect. Previous writers had used such *numeri* by accident only: the pleasing result was noticed and *certi cursus conclusionesque verborum* (Orat. 178) now became a part of rhetorical technique. We also learn from Suidas that Thrasymachus πρῶτος περίοδον καὶ κῶλον κατέδειξε καὶ τὸν νῦν τῆς ῥητορικῆς τρόπον εἰσηγήσατο. Greek writers use the term κόμμα for a section of the κῶλον. Cicero translates κόμμα by *incisum*, κῶλον by *membrum*, and περίοδος by *ambitus*, *comprehensio*, &c. There is a close connexion between this articulation of the sentence and the use of *numeri*. The theory of the period is that of a rise and a fall. Roughness is permissible as the sentence storms its way onward, but harmony must be restored at the τελευτή. Later Greek writers use the suggestive term κρότος, i.e. 'beat', for the end of the clause or sentence. The Latin word is *clausula*. Wherever the voice halts, a musical effect is required. The *numeri* coincide with the beats and reveal the secret of ancient punctuation.

The invention of Thrasymachus was supplemented by Gorgias, who introduced his well-known σχήματα, viz. ἰσόκωλα, ἀντίθετα, and ὁμοιόπτωτα. These are considered by Cicero to form a part of the

oratorical *numerus*.[1] The ῥυθμοί of Thrasymachus were combined with the σχήματα of Gorgias by Isocrates, of whom Plutarch says that he spent a lifetime on his Panegyric, pasting together antitheses and balanced clauses with similar cadences, smoothing his periods with chisels and saws and making them musical (ῥυθμίζων).[2] Demosthenes makes more sparing use of the σχήματα than Isocrates, in whose prose they are so constant as to become monotonous, but greatly developed the use of ῥυθμοί. Thrasymachus had relied for effect upon the paean, a foot which was thought most suitable for prose, since it was little used in verse. Demosthenes preferred the cretic, which, as ancient writers point out, is metrically equivalent to the paean (i.e. – ∪ – is equal to – ∪ ∪∪ or ∪∪ ∪ –). The beginning of the De Corona τοῖς θεοῖς εὔχομαι πᾶσι καί became proverbial, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus remarks that the proem in this, his most carefully written speech, is founded on the κρητικὸς ῥυθμός.[3] He also continually uses a cretic followed by a trochee or spondee (the final syllable being regarded as *anceps* by ancient metrists) and μηδὲ τοξεύῃ is quoted by Quintilian as an example of his *severa compositio*.[4] Other favourite endings with him were a double trochee or double spondee. Cicero held him up as an example to those who object to the use of *numeri*, saying that his lightning was so brilliant because it was winged with numbers.[5]

Subsequent writers, especially those connected with Asia, further developed the practice of Demosthenes. The double trochee now became the favourite ῥυθμός and was used with monotonous regularity: so much so that it became characteristic of the school. The Romans adopted the use of *numeri* from Asiatic teachers before the Ciceronian era. Thus in 90 B.C. Carbo, addressing the people, said:[6]

> Quicumque eam violassent, ab omnibus esse ei poenas persolutas. Patris dictum sapiens temeritas filii comprobavit.

Cicero notes the double trochee, *pērsŏlūtās*, and says of the second double trochee, *cōmprŏbāvĭt*:

> Hoc dichoreo tantus clamor contionis excitatus est ut admirabile esset. Quaero, nonne id numerus effecerit? verborum ordinem immuta: fac sic, *comprobavit filii temeritas*, iam nihil erit.

Cicero was at great pains to set forth the theory of the subject in his *Orator*, a work dedicated to the Atticist Brutus, and intended to convert him to the use of *numeri*. While his account of the origin

[1] Orator, § 202.
[2] De Gloria Athen. ch. 8.
[3] Περὶ συνθέσεως ὀνομάτων, § 204.
[4] ix. 4. 64.
[5] Orator, § 234.
[6] ib. 214.

and object of the practice is admirable, it cannot be said that his rules are lucid. He does not appear to have grasped the secret principles by which he was guided. These were first ascertained by the patient analysis of modern scholars.

Zielinski, following in the path of previous inquirers, notably W. Meyer, Norden, and Wolff, a pupil of Skutsch, has shown that in Cicero the three favourite clausulae are

1. – ∪ – – ∪
2. – ∪ – – ∪ ∪
3. – ∪ – – ∪ – ∪

It will be noticed that the first of these is identical with the μηδὲ τοξεύῃ of Demosthenes, the second is a double cretic and is identical with τοῖς θεοῖς εὔχομαι, the third consists of a double trochee preceded by a cretic as in the stock example quoted from Carbo, *filii comprobavit*. Zielinski explains the three forms as consisting of a cretic base, followed by a trochaic cadence of varying length. It may be remarked that this is stated in so many words by Terentianus Maurus (*c.* 190 A.D.), who assigns to the cretic a *sedes beata* just before the end of the period, when the clausula is completed by a trochee or dactyl.

> Optimus pes et melodis et pedestri gloriae:
> Plurimum orantes decebit, quando paene in ultimo
> Obtinet sedem beatam, terminet si clausulam
> Dactylus, spondeus imam, nec trochaeum respuo.
> Bacchicos utrosque fugito, nec repellas tribrachyn.
> Plenius tractatur istud arte prosa rhetorum.

These three forms without any licence of any kind account for 44 per cent. of the clausulae in the speeches, 17,902 in number. He also recognizes a strong form of the base in Forms 2 and 3, viz. a molossus instead of a cretic.[1] The addition of these brings the total up to 60 per cent. Various licences are permitted, the chief of which is that any long syllable may be replaced by two shorts, e.g. *ēssĕ vĭdēātŭr*. Also certain variations in the base are allowed, e.g. a choriambus or epitriton (*tr.*) in place of the cretic, as in *ēxĭgŭō tēmpŏrĕ, pūblĭcē sūbscrībĭtŭr*; or the trochaic cadence may be prolonged by another syllable, thus creating a Form 4, e.g. *spīrĭtūm pērtĭmēscĕrēm*. This accounts for another 26 per cent., raising the total to nearly 87 per cent. The remaining forms need not detain us now, with the exception of some striking cases in which, for rhetorical effect, a spondee is used in the cadence instead of a trochee, e.g. *cārcĕrēm cōndēmnātī*, where the light beat is replaced by a stroke from the hammer.

[1] I denote the strong forms by Roman numerals (ii, iii, &c.).

Zielinski has since been occupied in investigating the *numeri* of the colon. In a letter which I received from him a few days ago he tells me that he has now gone through the speeches and tabulated the cola, 130,000 in number, and hopes soon to publish important conclusions. Meanwhile the general theory is clear from a passage in Quintilian (ix. 4. 70), who points out that some clausulae are halting and limp, if left to themselves, but are propped up by the context. He quotes

'Non vult populus Romanus obsoletis criminibus accusari Verrem,' durum si desinas, sed cum continuatum sit iis quae sequuntur . . . 'nova postulat, inaudita desiderat,' salvus est cursus.

The harsh *numeri* are comparatively frequent in the cola, while harmony is restored in the clausula. ' It may be noticed that the period frequently falls into strophes, recalling the measures of lyric poetry, which, curiously enough, Latin writers considered not to have a strict metrical system. This arrangement by strophes enables us to express by symbols what Cicero termed *concinnitas*.

Cicero's system is uniform throughout his writings, with the exception of the letters to Atticus. Many of the letters *ad Familiares* are just as metrical as his speeches. The *Commentariolum Petitionis* ascribed to Quintus is written in the same style. The strict Atticists of his day, Sallust and Caesar, do not resort to *numeri*, and Brutus was not convinced by the *Orator*, which Cicero dedicated to him (Att. xiv. 20. 4). It is interesting to notice that the Letters of Brutus, the genuineness of which has been doubted, are not metrical. Among subsequent writers I find no use of *numeri* in Cornelius Nepos. The practice of Livy is exactly opposite to that of Cicero. He shows a marked partiality for the forms which are least common in Cicero, notably for the spondaic ending. In this connexion Cicero has an illuminating remark (Orat. 212), '*cursum contentiones magis requirunt, expositiones rerum tarditatem*,' i.e. History prefers a spondaic measure. The *compositio* of Tacitus was intentionally harsh. He was the Wagner among Roman composers and produced music out of discords. With these few exceptions, and some technical works for which such ornament was unsuitable, all subsequent Latin authors were possessed by the spell.

Just as the later Greek authors tend to monotony, as compared with the free measures of Demosthenes, so in Latin the tendency is to uniformity of type. This is already visible in the prose of Cicero. Zielinski points out that in the early speeches the molossus base, in Forms 2 and 3, is almost as frequent as the cretic, while in the later

speeches the cretic is considerably more frequent. Quintilian actually includes the strong form of 2 among the bad clausulae (ix. 4. 104), and it is notably rare in the younger Pliny. So in the fifth century Martianus Capella speaks of the *vitium* in Cicero's ending *ad meas capsas admisero* (Div. in Caec. 51). The highly metrical prose of such writers as Minucius Felix (*c.* 162), St. Cyprian (200–57), and Symmachus (350–420) recognizes few *numeri* except Forms 1, 2, 3 (the cretic base in 2 and 3 being predominant), a Form 4, and the *esse videatur* clausula (1^2). These are used in all the cola as well as in the clausula proper, the effect being very monotonous.

The excess to which these writers carried the use of *numeri* may be seen from a passage in Symmachus (*in Valent.* ii. § 24–6). I add in brackets the symbols employed by Zielinski:—

Ventilemus prīscă mŏnŭmēntă (1^2), scrutēmŭr ānnālēs (1): invenies vetustatem paene ignaram flūmĭnūm quāe tĕnētĭs (3). Ipsi illi vates exoticis nominibus licēntĕr ōrnātī (1), cum ad Indicum Gangen et Borysthenen Scythicum cārmĕn ēxtēndĕrĭnt (2), Nigrum parem maximis ignoratiōnĕ sĭlŭērūnt (1^2). Nunc primum victoriis tuis externūs flŭvĭūs pūblĭcātŭr (3 *tr.*): gāudēāt sērvĭtūtĕ (3), captīvŭs ĭnnōtŭĭt (2). Elementis quodam modo ditatam cērnŏ rēmpūblĭcām (2), cui omnes incōgnĭtī mānclpāntŭr (3), longinqua tērră cōniūngĭtŭr (2). Dum orbis tērmĭnōs qūāerĭs (1), gēntĭūm sūstŭlīstī (3). Parum quiddam naturae superest quod adhuc populus Romānŭs ĭnquīrăt (1). Relabi credis imperium nisi sēmpĕr āccēssĕrĭt (2). Quid si impetus tuos institutio mōēnĭūm nōn tĕnērĕt (3)? nescis transīrĕ dēsērtă (1).

We are in presence of a phenomenon similar to that by which the Greek Hexameter tends to become more and more dactylic in character. The luxuriance of Homer gradually dries up and finally in Nonnus (*c.* 500 A. D.) we find that 25,000 verses yield only nine types of hexameter, while 35 per cent. of his lines consist of dactyls only.

Sidonius Apollinaris (*c.* 431–82), Bishop of Auvergne, carried on the tradition of Symmachus, whose *rotunditas* he praises and sets before himself as a model. The prosody of these accomplished men is correct, as is to be expected in persons of their culture. The only deviation which Symmachus makes in the passage quoted above from the prosody of Cicero is that he appears to scan *cernŏ*. Other writers long before this time wrote in a very different style. Foreigners and barbarians found it extremely difficult to master the quantity of Latin vowels. On the other hand the theory of the Latin accent is very simple, the chief point being that words in which the penultimate is long are

paroxytone, e.g. *perfrégit*, and those in which it is short are properoxytone, e.g. *víncula* (Orator, § 58, Quintil. i. 5. 29). We soon find strange scansions, such as those of the Spaniard Juvencus (*c.* 330), who has *lăborum*, *lătĭcibus*, *fŭturum*, and ends the hexameter with, e.g., *praesentat*, *Aegypti*, &c. Still earlier we have the astonishing hexameters of the Syrian Commodianus (*c.* 238), who begins his *Instructiones* with

Prima praefatio nostra viam errantĭ dĕmonstrat
Respectatque boni cum venerĭt seculĭ metra.

The first line of his *Apologeticum* is

Quis poterĭt unum proprie deŭm nosse căelorum?

Teuffel says of him that 'his hexameters in defiance of metre and prosody merely follow the ear and the accentuation of every-day pronunciation'.

It is only natural that the prosody of prose-writers should exhibit similar defects. In order to appreciate this point it is necessary to consider the relation of accent to ictus in the clausula. In Cicero these as a rule coincide, as in—

(1) ´ ∪ – ´ ∪, e.g. *víncla perfrégit.*
(2) ´ ∪ – ´ ∪ ⏑, e.g. *víncla perfrégerat.*
(3) ´ ∪ – ` ∪ ´ ∪, e.g. *vínculum frègerámus.*

It will be observed that in the last instance I have placed a minor accent over the first syllable of *fregeramus*. This is in conformity with all modern writers, who show that long words cannot be pronounced without the help of minor accents. (Cf. Lindsay's *Latin Language*, p. 161.)

While agreement is normal, there are certain cases in which there is a conflict, as in Zielinski's second Form where a molossus is base and there is no caesura, e.g. *vincéntem frégerat*, or when the clausula ends with an iambic dissyllable. It is doubtless due to the tug of the accent that Martianus Capella censures Cicero's ending *consul vídet* (Cat. 1. 2).

The result of the enfeeblement of quantity and the stress of the accent was to produce what some writers have called a *cursus mixtus*, a very convenient term which means that some of the clausulae are metrical, while others follow the accent without regard to the quantity. All that is necessary is to have the accents in the right place. The result is that the metrical prose of St. Cyprian, Symmachus, and Sidonius gives way to accentual or rhythmical prose. Form 1 is succeeded by a rhythmical equivalent consisting of five syllables, e.g.

génus humánum, Form 2 to one of six, e.g. *bóna remédia*, and Form 3 to one of seven, e.g. *fáciunt mèritórum*. We also find accentual equivalents for other metrical clausulae, e.g. *víctor redítúrus* = *ēssĕ vĭdĕātŭr* (1[2]), and (*excell*)*éntiae véstrae scribere* = *ōptĭmō iūrĕ cōntĭgĭt* (4).

This mixture of metre and rhythm is found in various writers during the latter half of the fourth century. Some of these are Pagans, e.g. Ammianus Marcellinus and Vegetius, others Christian, e.g. St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Augustine.

I quote the following specimen from St. Jerome (A.D. 331–420), Epistles xxiii. I mark the clausulae by accents, except in the case of two, viz. *angelorum choris* and *palmatum consulem*, which are metrical, and do not give a clausula by the other method. In several cases accent and metre agree, others are purely accentual.

Nunc igitur pro brevi labore aeterna beatitúdine frúitur (2), excipitur āngĕlōrūm chŏrīs (2), Abrahae sínibus cònfovétur (3) et cum páupere quóndam Lázaro (4), dívitem pùrpurátum (3), et non pālmātūm cōnsŭlēm (ii) sed atratum stillam digiti minoris cérnit inquírere (2). O quanta rérum mutátio (2)! Ille qui ante paucos dies dignitatum omnia cúlmina pràecedébat (3), qui quasi de subiectis hóstibus trìumpháret (3), Capitolínas ascéndit árces (3), quem plausu quondam et tripudio populus Románus excépit (1), nunc desolátus et núdus (1) non in lacteo cáeli palátio (2), ut uxor mentítur infélix (1), sed in sordentibus ténebris còntinétur (3).

I do not find any systematic use of *clausulae* in his translation of the New Testament.

St. Augustine (350–430) says of his own practice 'ego in méo elóquio (2) quantum modeste fíeri árbitror (2) non praetermitto istos números claùsulárum' (3). In another passage, when commenting upon the Epistle to the Romans xiii. 14, he says that if the Latin translator had stooped to such artifices he could have produced a *clausula numerosior*, but that he preferred to keep the order of the original. In the course of his remarks, he mingles rhythmical forms, e.g. *locútus apóstolus* (2), *cúrrere nùmeróse* (3), with metrical, e.g. *lēgĕ cōmpōnăt* (1), *affirmārĕ nōn aūdĕō* (2).

The prose of the Syrian Ammianus Marcellinus (330–400) is much more accentual than that of Jerome, as the following specimen will show (xvii. 5. 3):—

Rex regum Sapor párticeps síderum (2), frater Sólis et Lúnae (1), Constantio Cáesari frátri méo (3) salutem plúrimam díco (1). Gaudeo tandemque mihi placet ad optimam víam te rèvertísse (3)

et incorruptum aequitatis agnovísse suffrágium (2) rebus ípsis expértum (1), pertinax aliéni cupíditas (2) quas aliquotiens edíderit stráges (1). Quia igitur veritátis orátio (2) soluta esse débet et líbera (2) et celsióres fortúnas (1) idem loqui decet átque sentíre (1), propositum méum in paúca cónferam (4), reminiscens haec quae dicturus sum me sáepius rèplicásse (3). Ad usque Strýmona flúmen (1) et Macedónicos fines (1) tenuísse maióres méos (3) antiquitates quoque véstrae testántur (1), haec me cónvenit flàgitáre (3), ne sit ádrogans quòd adfírmo (3), splendore virtutumque insígnium série (2) vetustis régibus àntistántem (3).

The Sermons of Leo I (Pope 450 A.D.) are rhythmical: so also is the Leonine Sacramentary, which, whatever its authorship, is of great interest as the oldest collection of this kind. This may be seen from one of the first Collects :—

Tuas enim Domine virtutes tuasque victórias àdmirámur (3), quoties in Ecclésia Túa (1) horum dierum fésta celebrántur (1^2), quos insignes confessórum tuórum (1) et mártyrum pálmae (1) ad perénnem memóriam (2) solemnémque laetítiam (2) fidelibus pópulis sàcravérunt (3).

The prose of Boethius (480–524) seems to me of special interest. His theological writings are in the usual *cursus mixtus*. Thus in the *de Trinitate* I find such endings as *númerum fácit* (1), *pluralitatémque perfícere* (2), *fáciunt mèritórum* (3), *unitátum repetítio* (2^2). On the other hand his *Philosophiae Consolatio*, where he is modelling himself upon Cicero, is metrical. This is interesting as showing that it was possible for one writer to use both methods. The metrical clausulae predominate in the *Mythologicon* of Fulgentius (480–550), but I find accentual endings such as *cítius òbitúrum* (3), *collégio nón donétur* (3). Cassiodorus (480–575) writes in a *cursus mixtus* complicated by assonance and rhyme. Gregory of Tours (538–594) writes accentual prose in which the metrical element is recognizable.

The letters of Gregory the Great (540–604) are considered to mark the full development of this mixed style. I quote the following specimen (1. 10):—

Supplicaverunt nobis Hebraei Tarracínae degéntes (1) ut locum quem synagogae háctenus hàbuérunt (3), eum illis nostra quoque auctoritate esset habéndi licéntia (2). Sed quia pervenit ad nos quod locus ipse sic vicinus ésset ecclésiae (2) ut etiam ad eam vox psalléntium pèrveníret (3), scripsimus fratri et coepíscopo nóstro Pétro (3) ut si esset ut vox de eodem loco in ecclésiam rèsonáret (3), Iudaeorum celebratiónibus prìvarétur (3).

Various writings of this period, e.g. the Sermons of St. Innocent I, St. Boniface, and St. Gaudentius, the *Professio Fidei* of Bachiarus Monachus, &c., are equally rhythmical.

It is the opinion of the specialists who have worked upon this branch of the subject that rhythm in prose fell into abeyance about this time. Thus the Benedictines of Solesmes say that '*à partir de saint Grégoire le Grand le rythme semble s'exiler pour quatre siècles de la prose littéraire*'. The statement is one of great importance for liturgical students, since it enables them to fix the date of old rhythmical texts. I have not attempted to check it, since this would involve much labour, and I feel that the question should be left to experts. I would only remark that a Decree passed at the Synod of Toledo in 653, some fifty years after the death of Gregory, is quoted by W. Meyer as an example of accentual prose. Also, I should have thought it likely that the old tradition would survive in some places. As we shall see shortly, it was revived four centuries later by teachers proceeding from Monte Cassino, and I should have thought it more likely that the art had lingered on there, than that it had been wholly lost. If once forgotten, it would in all probability have been lost for ever. I also notice in the letters of Servatus Lupus, who was educated at Fulda and was Abbot of Ferrières from 841 to his death about twenty years later, a *cursus* which I cannot distinguish from that current in the seventh century. I quote the beginning of his first letter:—

Diu cunctatus sum desideratíssime hóminum (2), auderem necne excellèntiae véstrae scríbere (4). Et cum me ab hoc officio aliae rationábiles caúsae (1), tum etiam eo máxime dèterrébat (3), quod posse id contíngere vìdebátur (3), ut, dum vestram cuperem amicítiam còmparáre (3), offénsam incúrrerem (2). Scilicet quod praepropero et inūsĭtātō prōrsŭs ōrdĭnĕ (iv *tr.*) ab ipso familiaritatis múnere ìnchoáverim (4), qui nec primordia notítiae còntìgíssem (3).

Here all the clausulae appear to be accentual with a single exception, which, however, admits of a metrical explanation, being identical with a variety of Zielinski's Form 4 (i.e. an epitriton $- \cup - -$ is admitted into the base in place of a molossus). I should, therefore, like to see some further discussion of this point.

We now pass on to the revival of the *cursus* in the eleventh century, when it was adopted by the Roman Curia and was the subject of elaborate rules. The prose of this period was largely epistolary. By this I mean not merely private letters, but elaborate and courtly compositions sent to ecclesiastical dignitaries, and diplomatic documents proceeding from the Papal Chancery. The usual term for such com-

positions was *dictamen*, writers were called *dictatores*, their art was known as *ars dictatoria*, and handbooks giving the rules were styled *summa dictaminis*. These treatises dealt with a variety of subjects, e.g. the proper method of addressing a correspondent, the choice of subjects and their arrangement, rules for the *exordium*, *narratio*, *conclusio*, and general information of an encyclopaedic character. The *dictatores* were very long-winded: thus a usual phrase for 'listen' is *vestrae probitatis agnoscat discretio*. They also use words *sola ornatus et bonae sonoritatis causa*. The Pope is to address various persons according to their status. To ordinary persons he sends *salutem et apostolicam benedictionem*, to the excommunicated he says *spiritum consílii sànióris*, to Jews and heretics *viam agnóscere véritàtis*. Rules for the rhythmical order are given in several of these works, and the terms *cursus planus*, *tardus*, *velox*, corresponding to Forms 1, 2, 3, come into use. It may be observed that '*planus*' is used in the sense of 'ordinary', just as *cantus planus* denotes plain song in the liturgy as opposed to elaborate compositions.

The first work on the *Ars dictandi* was the *Breviarium de dictamine* of Albericus, written at Monte Cassino (1075–1110). He does not give rules for the cursus, but employs it throughout, and says that prose should be *sonoram et distinctam, id est quasi currentem*.

When Urban II was elected Pope in 1088 he went to Monte Cassino, where Albericus was teaching, and chose as his secretary Johannes Caietanus in order that

> antiqui leporis et elegantiae stylum in sede apostolica iam pene omnem deperditum sancto dictante spiritu Iohannes Dei gratia reformaret ac Leoninum cursum lucida velocitate reduceret.

The phrase Leonine has here been interpreted as meaning in the style of Leo the Great, but more probably it refers to the rhythmical nature of the prose in question. Thus another writer uses the word as a synonym for *consonantia*.

Caietanus subsequently became Pope in 1118 under the name of Gelasius II. The cursus is found fully developed in his own letters as well as those which he had written for Urban II, and was adopted by his successors. The rules were published by Albertus de Morra, who became Pope in 1187 under the name of Gregory VIII. From this time onwards the term *stylus Gregorianus* is used to denote that used by the notaries of the Curia.

Gregory VIII adopts the mediaeval view that every dissyllable, whatever its quantity, is a spondee, e.g. *mărĕ*, *prāēbē*, *ămā*, *Rōmă* are

equivalents. A trisyllable, if paroxytone, e. g. *timóris*, is a spondee and a half, if proparoxytone, e. g. *négligens* or *fámulus*, is a dactyl. A long word like *èxcommùnicàtiónis* consists of four spondees. Rules are given for the composition of a sentence. It is best to begin with a spondee followed by a dactyl, e. g. *Déus ómnium*. It is allowable to employ continuous spondees, but not dactyls, e. g. *négligens fámulus áliquis*, since this makes the movement too rapid. The last word in the sentence should be preceded by a dactyl, e. g. *gáudia pèrvenire*, a canon which is obviously identical with the rule of Terentianus Maurus, who gives that place to the cretic, the quantitative predecessor of the dactyl, e. g. *gáudium pèrvenire*. The examples given by Gregory belong to the *cursus planus* and *velox*. Rules for the *cursus tardus* are added by his contemporary Transmundus, Vice-Chancellor of the Roman Church.

A large number of treatises based on that of Albericus were composed in Italy and elsewhere. Hugo of Bologna (*c.* 1124) replies to those who *Alberici monachi viri eloquentissimi librum viciant*, probably referring to Albertus of Samaria and others who denounced those '*scholasticos seu grammaticos dictatores qui dictamina more metrorum seu rithmorum cursitare sive claudicare coegerunt*'. Bonum of Florence (*c.* 1210) wrote a work called *Candelabrum*, the object of which was to give *populo dudum in tenebris ambulanti lucidissimam dicendi peritiam*. Boncampagnus, also of Florence (*c.* 1220), wrote an encyclopaedic work, the various books of which had fanciful names such as Oliva, Cedrus, Myrra, Rota Veneris. Thomas of Capua, Chancellor to Gregory IX (1227–41), wrote a *Summa dictaminis secundum Curiam Romanam*. A minor work by Galfridus de Vino Salvo deserves mention for his verses modelled on the beginning of the first Georgic :—

> vobis referam quo sidere vestrum
> dictamen lucere queat, quo clausula possit
> lascivire gradu.

They found imitators in other countries. Thus in Germany we have the *Saxonica summa prosarum dictaminis*, in which we are told *praecipua sit industria dictaturo ut stilum qui Romanus dicitur teneat et observet*. Ludolphus of Hildesheim gives mnemonic rules for the three forms of the *cursus*. Conradus of Mure *de arte prosandi* distinguishes prose from verse in the following lines :—

> Vultque venire metrum tanquam domicellula compto
> Crine, nitente gena, subtili corpore, forma
> Egregia.
> Prosaicus versus, res grossior.

The Gallican Church had the audacity to develop a rival school to the Roman, viz. that of Orleans. We have an *Ars dictandi Aurelianensis* with letters for the use of Bishops of Orleans, and Poncius Provincialis (1200–50), who lived at Orleans, is a writer belonging to this school. The Italian *dictatores* carried on a fierce polemic against their brothers of Orleans. Boncompagnus wrote, he tells us, in order that *viri scholastici per falsam et superstitiosam Aurelianensium, id est Gallicorum, sententiam, tanquam naufragantes . . . formam Sanctorum Patrum, Curiae Romanae et imperialis aulae stilum prosaico dictamine studerent imitari.* Thomas of Capua speaks in similar terms. I do not profess to have grasped the exact points where the Orleans school fell into heresy. Bonum of Florence says, *sed hoc aliter ab Aurelianensibus, aliter a sede Apostolica observantur. Aurelianenses enim ordinant dictiones per ymaginarios dactilos et spondeos. . . . Nos verum secundum auctoritatem Romanae Curiae procedemus quia stylus eius cunctis planior invenitur.* This, however, is not at all clear, since we find that Gregory VIII founds his *Forma dictandi* upon imaginary spondees and dactyls. I should suspect that the differences were invisible except to contemporary experts, whose acuteness may be seen from a reply of Innocent III (Pope 1198–1216):—

Litteris ipsis diligenter inspectis ipsi rescripsimus eas tam ex dictamine quod a stylo cancellariae nostrae discrepant omnino falsas esse.

Probably there was some professional jealousy in the matter. We find scribes from Orleans exercising their art in Rome itself: thus a Johannes Aurelianensis was Secretary to Alexander III (Pope 1159–81), and the Italian *dictatores* may have objected to the 'dumping' of foreign goods on their market. Also there was the perpetual friction between the Gallican Church and the Papacy.

One of the most interesting writers of this period is Johannes Anglicus, who wrote in Paris (*c.* 1270). There seems to me no reason for connecting him with the school of Orleans, since there was a feud between it and the University of Paris. He distinguishes between three kinds of *stylus*, viz. *Gregorianus*, *Isidorianus*, and *Hilarianus*. Of the first he says '*in hoc stilo considerantur pedes spondei et dactili, id est pedes cadentes ad modum spondeorum et dactilorum. In stilo Tulliano non est observanda pedum cadentia set dictionum et sententiarum coloratio*'. The *stylus Isidorianus* is said to be based on the Soliloquies of Isidore, in which the clausulae correspond *secundum*

leoninitatem vel consonantiam. This style, he says, is *valde motivus ad pietatem*, i. e. useful for sermons. He gives as an example

prius *legunt* quam *sillabicent*, prius *volant* quam *humi currant*. . . . Prius *montes scandunt quadrivii* quam per *valles incedunt trivii*, *volant* ad astra nec *pennas possident.*

This series of balanced antitheses reminds us of the σχήματα of Gorgias. It is singular to find the methods of the great Sicilian suddenly revived in the thirteenth century.

The *stylus Hilarianus* is so called as modelled on the hymn ascribed to Hilary:—

Primo dierum omnium
Quo mundus exstat conditus.

In this each verse consists of four iambics, or, as Johannes Anglicus scans it, of $2\frac{1}{2}$ spondees and a dactyl. He gives as an example a letter to be sent to the Archbishop of Paris by an Archdeacon who failed to attend a synod. This runs as follows:—

Cum essem in *itínere*, tendens ad vestram *sínodum*, caput meum *infírmitas* oppressit ita *súbito*, quod despero *resúrgere* portumque vitae *tángere*, nisi Dei *cleméntia* me visitare *márcidum* condignetur. Quare pater *mitíssime*, vestra dignetur *grátia* infirmo mihi *cómpati* meque languentem *hábeat* excusatum.

How different from the laconic excuses with which we are now so familiar!

The orthodox *stylus Gregorianus* became universal in Papal Bulls, letters, privileges, dispensations, indulgences, and excommunications. It was used in sermons, prayers, collects, chants, and graces. We also find it in non-ecclesiastical literature, as I shall show shortly.

Before passing on to other subjects it will be convenient here to state the definitions of the *cursus* given by mediaeval theorists and to explain the terminology employed by them.

Gregory does not himself employ the terms *planus*, *tardus*, *velox*, but gives examples which fall under the *planus* and *velox*. Transmundus speaks of three kinds, viz. *planus*, *velox*, and *ecclesiasticus*. The last of these was styled *tardus* by his successors. The examples given by Gregory which belong to the *cursus planus* are *audíri compéllunt* and *confidénter audébo*: those which fall under the *velox* are, *gaúdia pervenire*, *ágere nímis dúre*, *sufficiant ad volátum*. His general theory is that 'finales dictiones semper debet quasi pes dactilus antecurrere'. It will be noticed that this exactly corresponds to the statement of Terentianus Maurus about the *sedes beata* assigned '*paene in*

ultimo' to the cretic. He explains *gaúdia pervenire* as a dactyl followed by a paroxytone tetrasyllable, which may be replaced by two dissyllables (*nímis dúre*)[1] or a monosyllable and paroxytone trisyllable (*ad volátum*). Transmundus gives as examples of the *ecclesiasticus* or *tardus* the forms *operári iustítiam dirigéntur in éxitus*. These he explains as a tetrasyllable (or monosyllable and trisyllable) with a proparoxytone accent preceded by a word with a paroxytone accent. Gregory's account of the two forms which belong to the *planus*, viz. *audíri compéllunt, confidénter audébo*, is somewhat confusing. He explains these as a final trisyllable (without mentioning that this is paroxytone) preceded by a trisyllable or tetrasyllable. As a matter of fact, however, the number of syllables in the preceding word is not the determining point, but the paroxytone accent. Thus *nómen assúmens, sínit intérdum* equally belong to the *cursus planus*.

Recent writers have noticed other forms to which the *dictatores* did not give names. Grospellier[2] mentions the following, which he describes in terms modelled upon mediaeval theory :—

(1) tr. = trispondaicus, e. g. dóna sentiámus.
(2) dd. = dispondeus dactylicus, e. g. virtútis operátio.
(3) o. = octosyllabicus, e. g. flétibus supplicántium.
(4) m. = medius, e. g. { iúgiter póstulat, précibus nóstris, fovémur méritis.

The mediaeval method seems to me very cumbrous and it has led to much misconception. The results can be stated more clearly by the help of the symbols which Zielinski has invented for the metrical clausula out of which the accentual is developed. He considers the Form as a metrical whole and distinguishes the types by means of the caesura. Thus Form 1 (– ∪ – – ∪) has five possible types, viz. *iudicabatur*, *non oportere*, *morte vicistis*, *civitas possit*, *restitutus sit*, which he terms 1 α, 1 β, 1 γ, 1 δ, 1 ε. The other Forms he treats in the same way. Some types are much more frequent than others. His statistics show that in Cicero γ is the favourite type of Forms 1 and 2, while δ is characteristic of 3. In the middle ages these types have become predominant. The *cursus planus*, e. g. *sínit intérdum*, is identical with 1 γ, the *tardus*, e. g. *crúcis affíxio*, with 2 γ, and the velox, e. g. *gaúdia pervenire*, with 3 δ.

If we apply this method to the less frequent types collected by Grospellier, the first of these, *dóna sentiámus*, is identical with Cicero's

[1] This form contravenes Meyer's law (p. 22). [2] Santi, Il 'Cursus', pp. 25–26.

ēssĕ vĭdēātŭr, which indeed Grospellier quotes among his examples of this type. This is Zielinski's $1^2\,\gamma$ (i. e. the second long syllable in Form 1 is replaced by two shorts). So *virtútis operátio* corresponds to *ēssĕ vĭdēāmĭnī*, i. e. $2^2\,\gamma$: *flétibus supplicántium* is metrically as well as accentually identical with Zielinski's Form 4 ($- \cup - - \cup - \cup \asymp$). The three varieties of the so-called *medius cursus* belong to the δ type. Thus *iúgiter póstulat* = *cāllĭdē fēcĕrĭt*, i. e. 2 δ, *précibus nóstris* = *cīvĭtās pōssĭt*, i. e. 1 δ, while *fóvémur méritis* appears to correspond to *crēdātĭs pōstŭlō*, i. e. ii δ (I denote the 'strong' variety of Forms 2 and 3, i. e. with molossus base, by Roman numerals).

We are now in a position to draw up a list of endings permissible in the *cursus* of this period, which will, I think, be more intelligible, viz. :—

1 γ e. g. audíri compéllunt (*planus*).
$1^2\,\gamma$ e. g. dóna sentiámus.
1 δ e. g. précibus nóstris.
2 γ e. g. operári iustítiam (*tardus*).
$2^2\,\gamma$ e. g. virtútis operátio.
2 δ e. g. iúgiter póstulat.
ii δ e. g. fovémur méritis.
3 δ e. g. gáudia pervenírе (*velox*).
4 δ e. g. flétibus supplicántium.

The variety of the *tardus* given by Transmundus, viz. *dirigéntur in éxitus*, has a minor caesura, and is strictly 2 γ δ, but of course *in exitus* is treated as one word. So the varieties of the velox, viz. *suffíciant ad volátum* (where the same explanation applies) and *ágere nímis dúre*, are strictly 3 δ ϵ and 3 δ ζ. The presence of the δ division is the important point.

I do not wish to imply that the *cursus* was always employed strictly according to the rules laid down by the *notarii* of the Roman Curia. It is, however, unmistakably present in a vast body of literature such as the *Policraticus* of John of Salisbury (1110–1180), the writings of St. Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274), and the correspondence of Héloïse and Abelard. I add an extract from a letter of Héloïse :—

Cum me ad temporales olim voluptátes expéteres (2), crebris me epístolis vìsitábas (3), frequenti carmine tuam in ore omnium Heloíssam ponébas (1). Me plateae omnes, me domus síngulae rèsonabánt (3). Quanto autem rectius me nunc in Deum quam tum in libídinem èxcitáres (3). Perpende, quaéso, quae débes (1), atténde quae póstulo (2) et longam epistolam brevi fíne conclúdo (1).

The style of sermons may be illustrated by St. Bernard of Clairvaux: Quam gloriosi revertuntur victóres de praélio (2). Quam beati moriuntur martýres in praélio (2). Gaude, fórtis athléta (1), si vivis et víncis in Dómino (2). Vita quidem fructuosa et victória glòriósa (3), sed utrique mors sacra iúre praepónitur (2). Nam si beati qui in Dómino mòriúntur (3) non multi magis qui pro Dómino mòriúntur (3)?

It is stated by the experts who have worked upon this subject that the *cursus* began to decline under Nicholas IV (1288–92) and that it disappeared from Bulls in the fourteenth century, except in the case of formulae which were reproduced from earlier documents. This, again, is an assertion which I must take on trust, since I have no time in which to verify it. In any case the *cursus* survived in literature in its most exact form, e.g. in the Latin works of Dante (1265–1321), the letters of Petrarch (1304–1374), those of his friend Cola di Rienzo, and the letters and *de Mulieribus Claris* of Boccacio. I cannot refrain from quoting the famous letter of Dante to the Florentines, which derives additional interest from the fact that W. Meyer has made a certain correction in the text upon rhythmical grounds:—

O miserrima Faesulanórum propágo (1) et iterum iam punîta barbáries (2). An parum timoris praelibáta incútiunt (2)? Omnia vos tremere árbitror vìgilántes (3), quamquam spem simulétis in facie verbóque mendáci (1), atque in somniis expergísci plerúmque (1), sive pavescentes infúsa praeságia (2), sive diurna consília rècoléntes (3). Verum si mérito trèpidántes (3) insanisse pénitet còndoléntes (3), ut in amaritúdinem pèniténtiae (4) metus dolorisque rívuli cónfluant (2), vestris animis infigénda supérsunt (1) quod Romane rei baiulus hic divus et triumphátor Henrícus (1) non sua privata sed publica mundi cómmoda sítiens (2), ardua queque pro nóbis aggréssus est (2) sua sponte penas nóstras partícipans (2), tanquam ad ípsum post Chrístum (1) digitum prophetie própheta diréxerit Ìsaías (3) cum spiritu dei revelánte predíxit (1), 'vere languores nostros ipse tulit et dolores nostros ípse portávit' (1). Igitur tempus amaríssime pèniténdi (3) vos témere prèsumptórum (3), si dissimuláre non vúltis (1), adésse conspícitis (2).

Punica barbaries was formerly printed in the first line. This reading yields a very doubtful sense and offends against the laws of the *cursus*. W. Meyer emends to *punita*, referring to the previous destruction of Florence by Totila. It is very difficult to distinguish between *t* and *c* in fourteenth-century MSS., but Mercati, who has examined the Vatican MS. which is the sole authority for this letter, is of opinion

that it really gives *t* not *c*. Meyer's correction is, of course, absolutely convincing.

With the dawn of the Renaissance the knowledge of quantity revived, and the *cursus* was abandoned as barbarous. Thus Coluccio Salutati says to a correspondent who had written to him a letter in which it was avoided :—

Cum omnia michi placeant, super omnia michi gratum est quod more fratrum ille sermo rhythmica lubricatione non ludit. non est ibi syllabarum aequalitas quae sine dinumeratione fieri non solet, non sunt ibi clausulae quae similiter desinant aut cadant. Quod a Cicerone nostro non aliter reprehenditur quam puerile quiddam quod minime deceat in rebus seriis vel ab hominibus qui graves sint adhiberi. Benedictus deus quod sermonem unum vidimus hoc fermento non contaminatum et qui legi possit sine concentu et effeminata consonantiae cantilena.

Coluccio and the other Humanists failed to observe that the accentual system was based upon one of quantity, and the art of *numerosa compositio* was lost, only to be recovered gradually during the last few years.

The development of the Latin *cursus* cannot be fully understood without some consideration of a similar phenomenon which appears in late Greek prose. Here also in the fourth century A. D. accent becomes the dominant factor, and the rhythm depends upon the interval between the accents. This discovery is due to the acumen of W. Meyer, who shows that from this time onward until the fall of the Byzantine Empire it became the fashion in prose for at least two unaccented syllables to come before the last accent in the κῶλον or period.

This explains the remark of Psellus (1018–1078), who states that the rhythm of prose depends upon the interval between the accents (ἔστι διαλέκτου μέλος ποιόν τι διάστημα ἐν διαφόροις συλλαβαῖς βαρυτονούμενον ἢ ὀξυτονούμενον). The typical clausulae are ἅπας σοφός, σοφίαν τιμᾷ, ἁπάντων ἀνθρώπων, διαλέγονται ἄνθρωποι. In the case of a long word like φιλοτιμούμενος, there is a minor accent on the third syllable before the last accent. The first two Forms, viz. ἅπας σοφός, σοφίαν τιμᾷ, have no analogies in Latin, since in it the last syllable is not accented : the second, viz. ἁπάντων ἀνθρώπων, is identical with the *cursus planus* (*génus humánum*), and the third, viz. διαλέγονται ἄνθρωποι, with the *tardus* (*bóna remédia*). This last Form, the double dactyl, corresponding to the old double cretic, e. g. φαιδρότησι λάμπουσαν, became very frequent. Meyer quotes a sermon written in 634 A. D., in which all the clausulae belong to this Form, so it must

have been considered *valde motivus ad pietatem*. The Byzantine and the Latin *cursus* therefore exemplify the same principle, viz. a 'binary movement', in which there are at least two unaccented syllables between the last two accents. In the *cursus planus* and *tardus* there are two syllables unaccented, e. g. *génus humánum*, *bóna remédia*, in the *velox*, e. g. *fáciunt meritórum* there are four. When the first unaccented syllable ends the last word but one, there may be an interval of three unaccented syllables, e. g. *víncla reseráre*, corresponding to the three short syllables in the metrical Form *ēssĕ vĭdēātŭr* (1[2]). When such a word as *reserare* does not occupy this place, but comes after a proparoxytone, e. g. *vínculum*, it is treated as the successor of the ditrochaeus, e. g. *vínculum rèseráre*, its first syllable receiving a minor accent.

The two articles of Meyer from which I take these observations are most profound and illuminating. He was the first to show the connexion between the Greek and Latin *cursus* and the common principle on which both were based, to state that metrical prose is founded upon the cretic, and to demonstrate the existence of a *cursus mixtus* in writers like Ammianus and Vegetius.

The statement hitherto accepted is that this *cursus mixtus* first appears in the fourth century A.D., e.g. in the writings of St. Augustine. I have recently arrived at the conclusion that it came into existence much earlier, and was in fact characteristic of vulgar or colloquial Latin, as opposed to the *sermo urbanus*.

While I was writing this paper, it occurred to me to glance at some of those authors whose prose is confessedly not metrical, or only partially so. I began with Petronius, thinking that it would be interesting to see how far the *bas-monde* conformed to metrical rules. In this inquiry I had been preceded by M. Émile Thomas, who found that, although a number of the clausulae were metrical, others were not, and arrived at the conclusion that the textual criticism of the author was not likely to be advanced by such a method of study. I looked first at §§ 70–71 and found that, though several clausulae were correct from the metrical point of view, others were recalcitrant, e. g.

fămĭlĭa ōccŭpāvĕrăt, sŭpēr mē pŏsĭtūm cŏcūm, cōntēntūs fŭīt rĕcūmbĕrĕ, cōntēntĭōnĕ Trĭmālchĭō, tēstāmēntō mĕō mănŭmīttō, mĕam hērēdēm făcĭō.

Others, though defensible, were harsh, e. g. *Cĭrcēnsĭbūs prīmām pālmām, vicēnsĭmam ēt lēctūm strātūm.*

It then occurred to me to look at the accents. The result was

surprising, since, where the quantities are wrong, the accents are correctly placed. In order to show this, I add the passage with the accents marked, and insert in brackets the Forms to which the clausulae belong:—

Paene de léctis deiécti súmus (3), adeo totum triclinium família òccupáverat (4). Certe ego notavi super me pósitum cócum (1), qui de porco ánserem fécerat (2), muria condimentísque feténtem (1). Nec contentus fúit recúmbere (2), sed continuo Ephesum tragoedum cóepit imitári (1^2) et subinde dominum suum sponsióne provocáre (1^2) 'si prasinus proximis circénsibus prímam pálmam' (3). Diffusus hac contentióne Trimálchio (2), 'amici', inquit, 'et servi homines sunt et aeque unum láctem bibérunt (1), etiam si illos malus fátus oppréssit (1). Tamen me salvo cito aquam lĭbĕrām gūstābūnt (*S* 2). Ad summam omnes eos in testamento méo manumítto (1^2). Philargyro etiam fundum lego et còntubernálem súam (3). Carioni quoque insulam et vicésimam et léctum strátum' (3 *tr.*).

The only clausula which does not suit the accentual method is *liberam gustabunt*, which, however, gives the metrical Form *S* 2 (i. e. a spondee takes the place of the trochee in the cadence). As hiatus seems normal in Petronius, I take *-césimam et* to correspond to the metrical Form $-\cup\cup-$, i. e. a choriambic base (*tr.*) before a double trochee.

I add another passage, § 103:—

Non est diláta fallácia (2) sed ad látus navígii (2) fúrtim procéssimus (2), capitaque cùm supercíliis (2) denudanda tonsóri praebúimus (2). Implevit Eumolpus frontes utriusque ingéntibus lítteris (2) et notum fugitivórum epigrámma (1^2) per totam faciem lìberáli mánu dúxit (iii *tr.*). Unus fórte ex vectóribus (ii *tr.*) qui acclinatus láteri návis (1) exonerabat stomachum náusea grávem (1) notavit sibi ad lúnam tonsórem (1) intempestivo inhaeréntem minstério (2), èxecratúsque ómen (3) quod imitaretur naufragorum últimum vótum (1) in cubíle reiéctust (1). Nos dissimulata nauseántis devòtióne (3) ad ordinem tristítiae rédimus (2), silentióque compósiti (2) réliquas nóctis hóras (3) male soporáti consúmpsimus (2).

The clausula *lìberáli mánu dúxit* seems to correspond to Zielinski's Form iii *tr.*, in which an epitriton ($-\cup--$) replaces a molossus in the basis. So also *fórte ex vectóribus* corresponds to ii *tr.*, in which the same change takes place. I have printed *reiéctust* (*reiectus est* MS.), since this seems to have been the popular pronunciation (Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 167). I also give the vulgar form *minstério* (*ministerio* MS.), since this seems demanded by the rhythm. The

evidence for *minsterium* in vulgar Latin is given by Lindsay (pp. 173 and 201). It is interesting to notice that in § 92 *in conspéctu minstránium* (1), and § 117 *detrectátor minstérii* (2) the rhythm seems to require the syncopated form.

I would mention in this connexion that the vulgar pronunciation *muliére*, for which Lindsay (p. 164) quotes the line of Dracontius (*c.* 4–90):—

Insuper et Salamon eadem mulière creatus

seems to occur in § 9 *muliére pugnásti* (1).

Caper quoted by Lindsay (p. 163) mentions that words ending in *-c*, like *adhuc*, *hac*, *illuc*, formed from the enclitic *-ce*, which have dropped their last syllable, are an exception to the general rule that the last syllable is not accented. So we find § 57 *oppónerent hác illác* (2), and § 63 *adhûc capillátus éssem* (3). I previously mentioned that hiatus was a characteristic of vulgar Latin. That this is the rule in Petronius appears from e. g. § 44 *denários mílle aúreos* (3), § 66 *excellénte Hispánum* (1).

I do not wish to imply that all passages yield results quite so satisfactory as the two which I have quoted. The inquiry is as yet in its infancy, and I am content to indicate the principles involved. I would only say that wherever the eye rests one sees forms like *cáve contémnas* (1), *válde sucóssi sunt* (2), *honestióres cenábant* (1), *hómo negótians* (2), *líteras dídici* (2), *voca cócum in médio* (2), *Trimalchiónis topánta est* (2), *stramentícium vàvatónem* (3), *tengómenas fàciámus* (3), *maiiésto et dignitósso* (3), *tetígerat mála mánus* (3), *cantabúndus et stélas número* (4), which carry their explanation written on them. Since everywhere the tendency is from multiplicity to uniformity, it will probably be found that the *cursus* of Petronius is richer in forms than that of writers in the fifth century.

While the colloquial parts of the author are based on accent, the more elevated passages are metrical. I quote the following, § 2, using Zielinski's symbols:—

Grandis et ut ita dicām pŭdīca ōrātiō (ii *tr.*) non est maculōsă nēc tūrgĭdă (2), sed naturali pulchritūdĭne ēxsūrgĭt (1). Nuper ventosa istaec et enormis loquacitas Athenas ēx Ăsĭă cōmmĭgrāvĭt (3 *tr.*) animosque iuvenum ad māgnă sūrgēntēs (1) veluti pestilenti quodam sīdĕre āfflāvĭt (1), semelque cōrrūptā rēgŭlā (ii) stĕtĭt ĕt ōbmūtŭĭt (2^1). Ad summam, quis pōstēā Thūcȳdĭdīs (ii *tr.*), quis Hyperidis ād fāmām prōcēssĭt (*S* 2)? Ac ne carmen quidem sani colōrĭs ēnĭtŭĭt (1^3), sep omnia quasi eodēm cĭbō pāstă (1) non potuerunt usque ad senectūtēm

cānēscĕrĕ (ii). Pictura quoque non alium ēxĭtūm fēcĭt (1), postquam Aegўptĭōrum aūdācĭă (ii *tr.*) tam magnae artis compendiārĭam īnvēnĭt (1).

I next looked at Vitruvius, whose Latinity is known to have affinities with the *sermo vulgaris*. Some of his linguistic peculiarities are so striking that Ussing attempts to show that the work *de Architectura* cannot have been written during the Augustan period, but during the decadence of the Latin language and its transition to the Romance tongues. I took at random a passage, ii. 9. 10–11, *alnus . . . habent palos*. As this appears to be rhythmical, I mark the accents, and add in brackets Zielinski's symbols for corresponding metrical Forms:—

Alnus autem quae proxima fluminibus rípis procreátur (1^2) et minime materies utilis videtur habet in se egrégias ràtiónes (3). Est enim aere et igni plúrimo tèmperáta (3), non multum terréno umóre paúlo (3). Itaque in palústribus lócis (1) infra fundamenta aedificiorum palatiónibus crébre fíxa (3), recipiens in se quod minus habet in córpore liquóris (? 1^2) permanet immortális ad aetèrnitátem (3 *tr.*) et sustinet immania pondera structurae et sine vítiis consérvat (?). Ita quae non potest extra terram paulum témpus duráre (1), ea in umore obruta permanet ád diutùrnitátem (3). Est autem maxime id considerâre Ravénnae (1), quod ibi omnia opera et pública èt privâta (3) sub fundamentis eius géneris hábent pálos (3).

The passage is certainly not metrical, and seems to exhibit the same phenomena as those visible in the prose of Petronius with the exception of the clausula *vítiis consérvat*, which does not fall in with any system unless we consider it a rhythmical equivalent to Zielinski's *P* 1 (– ∪ ∪ – – ∪). I should not, however, be inclined to accept Ussing's theory concerning the date of the treatise, but should prefer to suppose that it is a specimen of accentual prose as written by plain folk in the Augustan era.

Another author whom I examined was Frontinus. The works attributed to him are a treatise *De aquis urbis Romae*, written in 97 A.D., and a book on military stratagems (*Strategematicon*), of which the fourth book is possibly a composition of a later date. I give the following citation from the first book of the *Strategematon*, ch. 6:—

Ventidius Parthico bello adversus Pácorum régem (1) non ignarus Pharnacem quendam natióne Cyrrhéstem (1) ex his qui sócii vìdebántur (3) omnia quae apud ípsos ageréntur (1^2) nuntiare Parthis perfídiam bárbari (2) ad utilitates súas convértit (1). Nam quae maxime fíeri cùpiébat (3), ea vereri se ne accíderent quàe timébat (3), ea ut evenirent optâre simulábat (1^2). Sollicitus itaque ne Parthi ante

transírent Euphrátem (1) quam sibi supervenírent legiónes (1²) quas in Cappadocia trans Taúrum habébat (1), studiose cum proditore egit, uti sollemni perfidia Párthis suadéret (1) per Zeugma traícerent exércitum (ii *tr.*), qua et brevíssimum íter est (2) et demisso alveo Euphrátem decúrrit (1): namque siílla venírent (1) adseverabat se opportunitate collium usurum ad eludéndos sagittários (ii²), omnia aútem veréri (1) si se infra ⟨per⟩ patentis campos pròiecíssent (*ditrochaeus*).

Much of the treatise *de aquis* is so technical that it can hardly be used for this purpose. I quote, however, the following from ch. lxxxviii:—

Sentit hanc curam imperatoris piissimi Nervae príncipis súi (1), regina et domina órbis in díes (1), quae terrarum déa consístit, (1) cui par nihil et nihil secúndum (1), et magis sentiet salubritas eiúsdem aetérnae úrbis (3), aucto castellorum, operum, munerum et lácuum número (2) nec minus ad privatos commodum ex incremento beneficiorum eíus diffúnditur (2).

Armed with these clues I finally looked at Cicero's Letters to Atticus, which are considered by all critics not to exhibit those metrical clausulae which characterize his other works. I selected a letter which has always seemed to me the most private in the collection, viz. iv. 5, in which he unbosoms himself concerning the painful incident of the *παλινῳδία* after the Conference of Luca. My surprise was great when I found that the clausulae appear to be accentual.

Sed valeant recta, vera, honésta consília (2), non est credibile quae sit perfidia in ístis princípibus (2), ut volunt esse et ut essent si quicquam habérent fidéi (1). Senseram, noram inductus, relictus, proiéctus ab íis (1), tamen hóc eram ánimo (2) ut cum iis in re pública cònsentírem (3): iidem érant qui fúerant (2). Vix aliquando te auctóre resípui (2). Dices ea tenus te suasísse ut fácerem (2), non étiam ut scríberem (2 *tr.*). Ego me hercule necessitatem mihi volui imponere huius nóvae coniúnctiónis (3), ne qua mihi liceret lábi ad íllos (1) qui etiam tum cum misereri mei debent non désinunt invidére (3). Sed tamen modici fúimus *ὑποθέσει* (3) ut scripsi: erimus uberiores si et ille libénter accípiet (2) et ii subringentur qui villam me moleste férunt habére (1) quae Cátuli fúerat (2), a Vettio me emísse non cógitant (2): qui domum negant oportuisse me aèdificáre (1), vendere aíunt opòrtuísse (3). Sed quid ad hoc, si quibus sententiis dixi quod et ípsi probárent (1), laetati sunt tamen me contra Pompei voluntátem dixísse (1). Finis. Sed quoniam qui nihil possunt ii me nólunt amáre (1), demus operam ut ab iis qui póssunt dìligámur (? 3).

Dices 'véllem iam prídem' (1). Scio te voluisse et me asinum germánum fuísse (1).

Here the only clausula which gives any difficulty is *qui possunt diligamur*, which, however, is metrically correct (– – – – ∪ – ∪ *i. e.* iii) or the ditrochaeus may be regarded as sufficient in itself. In *hóc eram ánimo* I allow hiatus as in vulgar Latin, and regard *eram* as unaccented (*cf.* Lindsay, p. 167, who says that *erat*, *erit*, &c., were unaccented or accented according to the caprice of the writer).

Other letters at which I looked appeared to confirm this analysis. Of course Cicero continually drops into his metrical style. Thus in 1. 16, a very private letter, of which he says in § 8, *in ea praesértim epístula quam nolo áliis légi* he goes on to refer to a lost speech and uses metrical clausulae.

I add the following passage from a letter of Caelius, Fam. viii. 6. 3 :—

Pompeius dicitur valde pro Áppio làboráre (3), ut ètiam putent alterum utrum de filiis ád te missúrum (1). Hic nos omnes absólvimus (2) et hercules consaepta omnia foéda et ìnhonésta sunt (4). Consules autem habemus súmma diligéntia (2^2): adhuc s. c. nisi de feriis Latinis nullum fácere pòtuérunt (3) Curioni nostro tribunátus conglóciat (2). Sed dici non potest quo modo hic ómnia iáceant (2). Nisi ego cum tabernariis et aquáriis pugnárem (?) veternus cìvitátem òccupásset (3 *tr.*). Si Parthi vos níhil calfíciunt (2), nos *non* nihil frígore frigéscimus (2 *tr.*). Tamen quoquómodo pótuit (2) sine Parthis Bibulus in Amano nescio quid cohorticulárum amísit (1).

The only clausula here which calls for comment is *aquáriis pugnárem*. This may be regarded as equivalent to Zielinski's *P* 1 ⏑ ∪ ∪ – ⏑ ⏑, a rare Form in which a dactyl appears in the base in place of the initial trochee. For the accent of *quoquómodo* cf. Lindsay, p. 169.

It would be a long task to examine the prose of Cicero's correspondents and determine whether they write metrically, rhythmically, or in neither style. The letters of Plancus are of course metrical like the elaborate compositions of Cicero himself when writing to Lentulus. A short letter of Pompeius at which I have glanced, Att. viii. 11. A, appears to be rhythmical from such clausulae as *íter habére*, *proficísci Corfínio*, *cohórtibus súbsequi*, *Lucériam vénias*, *tutíssimo púto fóre*. I find neither metre nor rhythm in the hurried dispatch of Caesar to Oppius, Att. ix. 13. *A*, or in the elaborate letter of Antonius, Att. xiv. 13. *A*.

I would conclude this investigation by a few remarks upon the nature of the Latin accent and its relation to the Greek. The Greek

accent was one of pitch, at any rate in classical times, so that there was no conflict between accent and quantity. At a later date it became one of stress. Thus accent is taken into account in the verse of Babrius, and in the fourth century A. D., as Meyer has pointed out, it became the regulating principle in prose. In the case of Latin the facts are wholly different. It is clear from a variety of considerations, such as the syncope of unaccented vowels, vowel changes, the shortening of the vowel in unaccented final syllables, and the accentuation of the Romance languages, that the original accent was one of stress. This is also evident in the indigenous Saturnian metre, which was essentially rhythmical. To quote Lindsay's description of this (p. 128), the line consisted of two halves, the first of which contained seven syllables with three accents, one always on the first syllable of the line, while the second half contained six syllables with two accents. He distinguishes between two types, viz.

(*a*) ´ ~ ´ ~ ~ ´ ~ || ´ ~ ~ ~ ´ ~

e. g. *dábunt málum Metélli* *Naévio poétae*

(*b*) ´ ~ ´ ~ ´ ~ ~ || ~ ´ ~ ~ ´ ~

e. g. *prím*(*a*) *incédit Céreris* *Prosérpina púer.*

When the Romans adopted the Greek quantitative metres, the influence of the accent in shortening unaccented syllables is seen in such lines of Ennius as

Virginĕs nam sibi quisque domi Romanus habet sas

and in various features of Plautine versification.

The Latin language being essentially rhythmical, was ill suited to the quantitative system. Thus Skutsch says 'Die Natur der lateinischen Sprache ist stark undactylisch', and has shown the various devices by which the poets adapted it to the Hexameter (*Zeitschrift f. d. Gymn.-W.*, 1909, p. 68). There would appear to have been a perpetual struggle to lessen the conflict between accent and ictus with the result that certain endings to the Hexameter and Pentameter become conventional. There remained, however, constant collision, as may be seen from the first line of the Aeneid.

Arma virumque cáno Tróiae qui primus ab oris.

So the disyllable at the end of the Pentameter, though possibly smoother than some other endings, causes a perpetual conflict. Mr. Robert Bridges considers that the music of Latin verse is assisted by these discords, since, if accent and ictus always agree, the effect becomes monotonous. This may be true, but I would point out that

there is no such conflict in Greek verse, and no one would say that this was less musical than Latin. Certainly this was not the view of the Romans themselves.

While the internal evidence shows clearly that the Latin accent was originally one of stress, it is equally indisputable that the Latin grammarians use terms which are inconsistent with the explanation. Cicero, Varro, and Quintilian are unanimous in speaking of pitch (*vocis altitudo, vocis fastigium*, &c.), and use precisely similar terms when describing the accent in both languages. It is usual to suppose that they borrowed Greek terms without noticing the essential difference between the two systems, but this cannot be considered a satisfactory explanation.

Prof. F. F. Abbott of Princeton has recently made a suggestion which appears to me most illuminating (*Classical Philology*, 1907, pp. 444–60). This is that, when the Romans took over the Greek metres, the Greek pitch-accent was also adopted in the *sermo urbanus*, while the native stress-accent survived in the *sermo vulgaris*. This would explain the language used by the grammarians, who wrote only for educated people and did not concern themselves with the talk of the vulgar, and the fact that syncope and vowel reduction were chiefly found in the *sermo plebeius*. In reply to the objection that orators who did not use the popular accent would not be understood by the masses, we may point out that the same objection would apply to the employment of the *sermo urbanus* itself, which was essentially artificial in vocabulary and construction. Abbott thinks that when Cicero tells us how the whole theatre would break out into an outcry if any false quantity was made by an actor, he is referring to the Senators and Knights by whom he was surrounded, who would be followed by the rest of the audience. It is interesting to notice that a similar explanation occurred to Leonardo Aretino in the fifteenth century.[1]

It may also be doubted if the difference between pitch and stress was in practice so great as we might at first suppose. Thus the accent in French resembles a pitch-accent, while our own is emphatically one of stress. Would the difference between the two methods of pronunciation have been greater than that of two Englishmen, one of whom had been educated in France and had a French accent?

On the other hand, this theory, if stated without qualification, runs contrary to certain facts. If there was no conflict between quantity and accent, how are we to explain the attempt visible in poetry to reduce this to the smallest possible proportions by the choice of certain

[1] Epp. vi. 8.

recognized endings in dactylic verse? So also in prose Zielinski has shown that the ictus of the clausula generally agrees with the accent, and that where there is a conflict the Form, or the type of the Form, which produces this conflict is never common and steadily becomes rarer. I would, therefore, propose a very slight modification of Abbott's view, viz. that in the *sermo urbanus* the accent *tended* to become one of pitch, but that the process was not complete. If so, the conflict would be slight, while it was sufficiently felt to be noticed and on the whole avoided.

Abbott's paper contains suggestions which appear to me very interesting in view of the results at which I arrived after studying the accentual system of Petronius and Cicero's Letters to Atticus. Thus he says (p. 457), 'When we bear in mind the great differences in pronunciation, vocabulary, and phraseology which are to be found between the Latin of the freedmen in Petronius and the Latin of Cicero or Quintilian, and when we recall the statements which the Romans themselves made concerning the vulgar tongue, we can readily believe that vulgar Latin and formal Latin were distinguished from each other in the character of their accents.' In a note on p. 458 he says, 'It would be quite possible for Cicero to modify his accent slightly in addressing the people, just as he makes his vocabulary and his phrases suit the topics which he discusses and the people whom he addresses in his letters.' This is practically what my analysis of such a spontaneous and unstudied document as Att. iv. 5 would show him to have done when writing in his most colloquial style to his most intimate friend.

I end this paper with a suggestion concerning the meaning of a passage in Cic. ad Att. xii. 6. 2. Tyrannio is said to have been the first person who introduced the theory of accentuation to the Romans (Lindsay, p. 151). He sent a book on the subject to Atticus. Cicero had arranged to read it with Atticus, but Atticus, to Cicero's annoyance, read it first by himself. Cicero, after expressing his disappointment, says:—

> Te istam tam tenuem *θεωρίαν* tam valde admiratum esse gaudeo. Etsi tua quidem sunt eius modi omnia. Scire enim vis, quo uno modo animus alitur. Sed, quaeso, quid ex ista acuta et gravi refertur ad *τέλος*?

In the Dublin edition *etsi* . . . *τέλος* is translated, 'The whole bent of your mind is for subtle speculations. You desire knowledge, which is the only *pabulum* of the mind. But, I ask you, what in that *acute and grave* treatise has any bearing on the *ultimate principle* of conduct?'

The editors say that there is a play upon the 'acute and grave' accents which were the subject of the treatise, and Cicero's work *De Finibus*, on the τέλος or *summum bonum*. This seems to be the recognized view. Professor Reid, however, dissents in a note added by the editors, and says, 'I feel sure that there is no allusion to the *de Finibus*.' He explains τέλος as referring to the end of Atticus, viz. the acquisition of knowledge. It occurs to me that τέλος may be used for the end of the sentence, i.e. Cicero asks, 'What is the relation of the accent to the clausula?'

184008

OXFORD
PRINTED AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
BY HORACE HART, M.A.
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

PA 2340 .C6 1910 SMC
Clark, Albert Curtis,
The cursus in mediaeval and
vulgar Latin 47067987